

[Home](#) > [Middle East and Islamic Studies](#) > [Encyclopaedia of Islam](#) > [Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition](#) > Islām

## Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition

### Islām

(7,304 words)

, submission, total surrender (to God) — *maṣḍar* of the IVth form of the root *S L M*.

#### I. DEFINITION AND THEORIES OF MEANING.

##### 1.—Qurʾānic references.

The “one who submits to God” is the *Muslim*, of which the plural *Muslimūn* occurs very often throughout the sūras.

Islām, on the other hand, occurs only eight times there; but the word must be considered in conjunction with the fairly common use of the verb *aslama* in the two meanings which merge into one another, “surrender to God”(an inner action) and “profession of Islām”, that is to say adherence to the message of the Prophet. The eight occurrences of Islām are as follows:—

a). Three verses stress its quality of interiority: “Whomsoever God desires to guide, He expands his breast to Islām” (VI, 125); Islām is a “call” from God, which must prohibit falsehood (LXI, 7) and which places whoever receives it “in a light from his Lord” (XXXIX, 22).

b). Three other texts, constantly quoted through the centuries, stress the connection between islām and *dīn* [*q.v.*]. It is certainly appropriate in this context to translate *dīn* as “religion”, though without forgetting the idea of debt owed to God which it connotes. “Today, I have perfected your religion (*dīn*) for you; I have completed My blessing upon you; I have approved

[Article Table of Contents](#)

[I. Definition and Theories of Meaning.](#)

[ii.—Diffusion of Islam](#)

islām for your religion” (V, 3), and “the religion, in the eyes of God, is islām” (III, 19). The surrender of the whole Self to God can alone render to Him the worship which is His due; whosoever should seek for another religion, his search would not be approved (cf. III, 85).

c). The action which operates islām supposes a “return” to God, *tawba*, a conversion. The Qur’ān speaks of “conversion to islām”—to condemn the unbelief (*kufṛ*) of those who had nevertheless made a profession of faith (IX, 74). Similarly it condemns the complacency of the Bedouins who boast of their islām “as if it were a favour on their part” (XLIX, 17). In addition: “Say: ‘Do not count your islām as a favour to me; nay, but rather God confers a favour upon you, in that He has guided you to belief, if it be that you are truthful” (*ibid.*). A little earlier, the very important verse XLIX, 14 had made a clear distinction between islām and *īmān*: “The Bedouins say: ‘we believe’. Say: you do not believe; rather say, ‘We surrender’ (*aslamnā*). Faith has not yet entered into your heart”.

It would therefore be an exaggeration to state, with A. J. Wensinck (*The Muslim Creed*), Cambridge 1922, 22), that “in the Qur’ān the terms islām and *īmān* are synonymous”. It is true that to recognize oneself as a Muslim and to be a believer are two existential realities which together take possession of a man’s whole being to ensure his salvation (*ibid.*). But the Qur’ān (XLIX, 14 and 17, and still more IX, 74) evokes an explicit profession of islām which is in no way a guarantee against the sin of *kufṛ*, and has no saving value unless it is the expression of faith. On comparing these verses with III, 19 and V, 3 (insistence on the idea of *dīn*), we see that the Qur’ānic statements themselves urge men to make islām not merely a (general) act of submission and surrender to God, and not merely obedience to God’s commandments, but also an affirmation which grants admission to the *ummat al-nabī*, the “people of the Prophet”, whatever their inner dispositions. These diverse connotations were to recur throughout the ages, as a result of the self-awareness brought about by the *umma*.

## 2.— Some *ḥadīths*.

In the collections of *ḥadīths* the emphasis, in defining islām, will be placed upon submission to God, expressed by deeds: above all, the prescribed acts of worship, including adoration of the One God, but also the *khayrāt*, “good works”. Thus, by way of example: in al-Bukhārī. ii, 37 (*ḥadīth* of Gabriel), after defining *īmān* by its content (“to believe in God, in His angels, in the future life, in the prophets, in the resurrection”), the Prophet, in reply to the question “What is islām?”, replies: “islām is to adore God without associating anything with Him, to observe the ritual prayer (*ṣalāt*), to pay *zakāt*, to fast during the month of *Ramaḍān*” (similar text in Muslim). But it is also “to give food (to the hungry) and to give the greeting of peace (*salām*) to those one knows, just as to those one does not know” (al-Bukhārī, ii, 5). And the best islām will be that of the *Muslim* of whom one has to “fear neither the hand nor the tongue” (*ibid.*, 4).

The *Musnad* of Ibn Ḥanbal (iii, 134; cf. A. J. Wensinck, *op. cit.*, 23) states: “islām is external, faith belongs to the heart”. The act of “surrender to God” is therefore expressed by holding fast to the ritual observances and social behaviour prescribed by the religious Law. God alone judges men’s hearts, and hence the reality of faith; the judgement of men may concern itself with islām. The “science of *fiqh*” has been called *maḳām al-islām* by the Ṣūfis.

### 3.—The relations between islām and imān .

The essential question of a theological order, which was discussed at a very early time and upon which the schools of *fiqh* and *kalām* were divided, was that of the distinction or non-distinction between islām and faith, and of their connection. The answers will depend upon the view taken of each of these concepts. We shall not go again into the question of the various definitions of *imān* [q.v.]. Here, very briefly, are the principal positions adopted.

a). The Mu‘tazilī schools, who identify faith and prescribed works, similarly identify faith with islām: it being clearly understood that the right intention, the *niyya* , is necessary for the validity of the deed —“actions are valid only through the intentions,” says the *ḥadīth* (al-Bukhārī, ii, 41). Whoever commits a grave transgression of the prescriptions of the Law loses the status of *mu‘min* and *Muslim*, and reverts to the status of *kufṛ* according to the Kḥāridjīs, to an “intermediate status” (between faith and unbelief) according to the Mu‘tazdlīs.

b). Many Ḥanafīs (Ḥanafī-Māturīdīs) similarly consider islām and imān to be synonymous, but define each of them essentially as verbal confession ( *ikrār* ), sometimes linking this with intimate adherence, or at other times, following the Murdji‘īs, with knowledge of the heart, or both of these. The Ḥanafī-Māturīdī texts of the *Fiqh Akbar I* (doubtless 2nd/8th century) and of the *Waṣīyyat Abī Ḥanīfa* (3rd/9th century) ignore the question. Towards the end of the 4th/10th century, however, the *Fiqh Akbar II* was to draw an at least nominal distinction. It was to state (a. 18) that current language distinguishes between imān and islām, and that islām is defined as “total surrender ( *taslīm* ) and total obedience ( *inḳiyād* ) to the divine commandments”. The text adds: “there is no faith whatever without islām, and islām could not exist without faith; the one and the other are like the outside and the inside [“back and belly”, in ¶ the literal translation of A. J. Wensinck]; and religion ( *dīn* ) is a name which covers both of them, and all the commandments of the Law”. Here then imān is as it were the inner, hidden reality of islām, from which it could not be separated.

c). In its definition of faith, the Ḥanbalī line insists upon affirmation by the tongue ( *ḳawl* ) and by deeds ( *a‘māl* ), either with or without the addition, according to the texts, of adherence of the heart ( *taṣdīq* ). So much so that al-Barbahārī (d. 329/941) was to say, according to the *Ṭabaḳāt al-Ḥanābila* : “We cannot testify to the reality of the faith in a man so long as he does not carry out the totality of the laws of islām” (quoted by H. Laoust, *La profession de foi d’Ibn Baṭṭa* , Damascus 1958, 82, n. I). Islam in the sense of observance becomes the guarantee of

faith. The Ḥanbalīs however were to remain faithful to the text of the *Musnad* cited above, and to the *Aḳida VI* of Ibn Ḥanbal, who affirms the distinction between *islām* and *īmān*.

Accordingly, in the 4th/10th century, Ibn Baṭṭa returns to the Ḳurʾān, XLIX, 14 and affirms: “The term *islām* does not have the same meaning as the term *īmān*. *Islām* is a word which denotes the community of religion ( *milla* ), and *īmān* is a word which expresses an adherence of faith ( *taṣḍīq* )” (from the translation of H. Laoust, *op. cit.*, 50/82). The choice of *milla*, and not *dīn*, in this text is characteristic: *islām* is “religion”, no longer solely in the sense of a debt due to God, but in the sense of a “religious community” attached and connected to a prophet (cf. below). Thus, in the 4th/10th century, we find the use of *islām* to denote the Muslim religion as an organized and differentiated religion. A century later, Ibn ʿAḳīl in the same way was to make *islām* obedience to the commandments of God. But he who commits a great transgression “does not lose his status of *muʾmin* to become merely *Muslim*, for *islām* forms part of *īmān*” (G. Makdisi. *Ibn ʿAḳīl et la résurgence de l’Islam traditionaliste au XI<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Damascus 1963, 527).

d). The Ashʿarīs and the Shāfiʿī jurists also made a distinction between *islām* and *īmān*. After defining faith as words and deeds, and then by its content according to the “*ḥadīth* of Gabriel”, al-Ashʿarī, in the *credo* of the *Maḳālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (ed. ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd, Cairo n.d., i, 322, identifies *islām* with the two constituent parts of the *shahāda*, in other words with the verbal testimony which grants admission to the Community of the Prophet, and concludes: “*islām* is different from *īmān*”. The *credo* of the *Ibāna* (ed. Cairo 1348, 10), without defining *islām*, states that it is “wider than faith” and specifies “that all *islām* is not faith”. If we compare these views with the text of the *Lumaʿ* which above all regards faith as inner adherence ( *huwa taṣḍīq, bi-llāh* cf. R. J. McCarthy, *The Theology of al-Ashʿarī*, Beirut 1953, 75/104), we understand that the later Ashʿarīs were able to claim that *islām*, the observance of the prescriptions ordained by the Law, and above all the explicit profession of the *shahāda*, can be “practised” without faith, and that faith (inner *taṣḍīq*) can exist without *islām* (here contradicting the Ḥanbalī line, for whom every believer is a Muslim). But *islām* without faith is the way of hypocrites ( *munāfiḳūn* ), consigned to God’s chastisement; faith without *islām* need not be culpable, in the event of some invincible external obstacle; it would become so if the testimony to *islām* was not given through cowardice, weakness or half-heartedness. It would then be a fault not of unbelief ( *kufr* ) but of grave prevarication ( *fisḳ* ).— When he summarizes the Shāfiʿī theses (which he contrasts with the identification made by the Ḥanafīs), ʿAlī al-Djurdjānī says that “ *islām* is the verbal profession of faith without the agreement of the heart, while faith is the agreement of the heart and the tongue” ( *Taʾrīfāt*, ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1845, 23).—This thesis was later to be generally accepted.

Whatever definition of faith might be proposed, it remains true however, for the Ḥanbalīs and the Ashʿarīs alike, that *īmān* and *islām*, without becoming identical, imply one another. *Islām*, says H. Laoust in summarizing the philosophy of Ibn Taymiyya ( *Contribution à une étude de la méthodologie canonique de (...) Ibn Taimīya*, Cairo 1939, 74, n. 3), is the “external and so to speak

social application of the Law”, and *īmān* in the “interiorization of *islām*”. (Thus once again, despite the difference of the conceptions involved, we come across “the outside” and “the inside”, *ẓahr* and *batn*, of the *Fikḥ Akbar II*). —An outline of the most usual teaching is provided in the 19th century by the *Ash‘arī* al-Bādjūrī ( *Hāshiya ... ‘alā Djawharat al-tawḥīd*, ed. Cairo 1352/1934, 28-9), who says: “*īmān* and *islām* are different in their significance but not in truth, that is to say in the subjects (who profess them) ... But it is a question here of faith which assures salvation, and of *islām* also, otherwise there would be no reciprocal connection”. The same nuances occur in the 20th century, for example in the *Ḥayāt Muḥammad* of Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal (Cairo 1358/1939, 506).—It should be noted finally that only certain *Ash‘arīs* and *Shāf‘īs* applied the term *mu‘min*, but not *Muslim*, to the man who has faith in his heart and who dies without having been able to profess *islām*. In general, it was considered preferable to call him *Muslim*, not before men but in the eyes of God.

#### 4.—The “world of *islām*”.

In this way, therefore, *islām* is “to give oneself *unconditionally* to God” (G. Makdisi, *op. cit.*, 324); so much so that, as the *yanbālls* were to take pleasure in saying, “the religion of all the prophets is *islām*”. Abraham, Moses and Jḥsus are true *muslimūn*. But it is the “seal of the prophecy”, manifested in the *Qur‘ān*, which was to “perfect the religion”. According to the first part of a much quoted *ḥadīth*, “the best of all things is *islām*; the foundation of *islām* is the ritual prayer” and, with the *ṣalāt*, all the other obligations ( *ibādāt* ) prescribed by the Law. Now, it is the observance of the Law, its “external and so to speak social application” (H. Laoust), which is the binding force of the Community of the Prophet. And so wherever the *qur‘ānic* prescriptions are observed communally, there *islām* will be; such will be “the lands of *islām* ( *bilād al-islām* ), “the world, the house, of *islām*” ( *dār al-islām* ).

Such expressions are traditional. It was in this way that, at the beginning of the 5th/11th century, al-Māwardī examined the various categories into which the *bilād al-islām* are divided ( *al-Aḥkām al-sultāniyya*, beginning of chap. xiv, ed. Cairo. n.d., 151 ff.). The implication remains that *islām*, practised in this way, is the testimony, rendered socially, to faith in the One God and to free adherence to the prophetic mission of Muḥammad. The Ḥanafī Sibṭ Ibn al-Djawzī (d. 654/1256) in his *Mir‘āt al-zamān* mentioned the “purchased” conversions of Jews and Christians, which the *Ash‘arīs* sought to make in Baghdād in the 5th/11th century, and he repeats the protests of the supporters of the *sharīf* Abū Dja‘far, a Ḥanbalī: “This is the *islām* of gifts, not the *islām* of conviction” (quoted by G. Makdisi, *op. cit.*, 356). Abū Ḥamid al-Ghazālī was similarly to question the degree of validity of a forced conversion to *islām*.

“There is no compulsion in religion” (*Qur‘ān*, II, 256), and “religion, in the eyes of God, is in truth *islām*” (III, 19). Even in the writings of those who distinguish most sharply between *īmān* and *islām*, at no time will this reference to inner conviction be found absent. But the point of



first importance, for the jurist who is studying and formulating the statutes and laws of the *bilād al-islām*, is not so much the degree of individual interiorization of the *muḳābal* of reciprocal relationship *islām-īmān*, as the communal observance of those prescriptions which make *islām*, those *sha‘ā’ir al-islām* “the blazon of Islam” (L. Massignon), which are symbolized by the banners of the *imāms*, the guides of the Community.

This is so true that a synonym of *dār al-islām* was to be *dār al-‘adl* “the world of justice”, in which “the rights of God and of men”, ordained by the *Ḳur’ān* are observed and protected. On the other hand there was to be the *dār al-kufr* “world of unbelief”, which is the *dār al-ḥarb* “world of war”. The jurists analyse the circumstances in which it can become “obligatory” to abandon the *dār al-kufr* in order to enter the *dār al-islām* or at least the *dār al-ṣulḥ*, which has concluded a treaty of “reconciliation” with the *dār al-islām*.—Anyone who describes himself as a *Muslim* means to affirm thereby not so much his care for the practice and personal observances (although certainly not neglecting such matters) as for adherence to a Community of those who acknowledge the *Ḳur’ān* and Muḥammad. It is here perhaps, far more than in any “sacral” conception of the political organization, that this specific spiritual-temporal fusion of the Muslim City has its root.

## 5.—From *islām* to Islam.

In European languages, it has become customary to speak of *Islam* to denote the whole body of Muslim peoples, countries, and states, in their socio-cultural or political as well as in their religious sphere. And it is in a similar sense that modern Arabic often uses *al-islām*. What connection does this very general meaning retain or not retain with the etymological significance of the word, and its évocation of “surrender to God” ?

This question, an important one if we wish to avoid misconceptions and misunderstandings, has been discussed recently in a well-documented and apposite manner by Professor Wilfred Cantwell Smith in *The Meaning and End of Religion* (New York 1964, chap. iv “The special case of *Islam*”, 75-108). As the author indicates, it is only recently (19th-20th centuries) that *Islam* has incontestably become the chosen term to signify both a religion and a politico-social area (fortunately replacing “Mohammedanism” “Islamism” and other such terms). Religious and cultural history thereby adopts the very name by which the *bilād al-islām* designate themselves, as with a title of honour. And it is merely since the beginning of the 19th century, probably under the influence of Western ideas, that writers in Arabic have employed it in an equivalent way.

W. Cantwell Smith emphasises, by reference to Brockelmann’s *Geschichte der arabischen Litteratur*, that this term *islām*, though comparatively rare in the *Ḳur’ān*, with the passage of time appears more and more frequently in the titles of works in Arabic. In the classical period (the Western Middle Ages) it was already used more commonly than *īmān*, and often in

correlation with *nizām*, System, organization; in the 19th century, the relative figures for *īmān* and *islām* are 7% and 93% respectively. It is this that Prof. Cantwell Smith calls “reification in Islam”. The emphasis thus appears to be placed on Islam as the organization and self-defence of the Community which is its expression, and much less on the inner ¶ Personal values which the etymology of the word connotes. It appears however that our present brief examination of the use of *islām* according to Muslim formulations and usage itself may suggest a few remarks here, which do not invalidate, but which limit and qualify the slightly different perspective of Prof. Cantwell Smith.

a). If it is true that *islām* signifies primarily the action and state of the man who surrenders himself totally (to God), nevertheless it would be erroneous to regard it, in this etymological sense, as a kind of synonym for *tawakkul bi-llāh*, the (interiorized) “abandoning” of oneself entirely into the hands of God. As the *Qurʾān* understands the word, *islām* is indeed, as the *Fikḥ Akbar II* says, a surrender ( *taslīm* ) to the divine Will as expressed by the *Qurʾānic* teaching, and an obedience ( *inḳiyād* ) to His commandments; and, by this very means, admission to the Community, “the best to have arisen among men” (*Qurʾān*, III, no). Quite soon, admission to the Community was to be the aspect preferred. If the requisite inner attitude does not correspond to it, there is some grave individual failing ( *fiṣk* ), there is no abandonment of *islām*.

b). Prof. Cantwell Smith observes that, in the classical age, the diversity of religious beliefs was to express itself by *milal* rather than by *adyān*. But we have already noted that the Ḥanbalī Ibn Baṭṭa, in the 4th century, defined *islām* as a *milla*, hence a community, the Community of Muḥammad. The difference between *dīn* and *milla*, al-Djurdjānī said ( *Taʾrifāt*, iii), is that “*dīn* relates to God, and *milla* to the Prophet”.

c). The *Qurʾān* however defines *islām* as religion, *dīn* (III, 19; V, 3); but not as a religion, Prof. Cantwell Smith justly notes. The plural of *dīn*, *adyān*, he further notes, does not occur in the *Qurʾān*. But if the religion, *al-dīn*, which renders to God that which is due to Him, is indeed *islām*, it is, through that very fact, *millat al-nabī* and *ummat al-nabī*. For the Muslim, Islam is not one religion among others, it is the religion, and the other religions ( *al-adyān* ) are such only in so far as they participate in Islam. Each prophet sent from God has his *milla*; but the *dīn* is unique, accomplished by surrender to God and obedience—the very definition of *islām*—already lived by the prophets that preceded it, and expressed accordingly to all its needs by the “seal” of the revelation, the *Qurʾān*.

We do not think that these various connotations are absent from the Muslim works of the contemporary period. To take one example only, we find them in the *Risālat al-tawḥīd* of Muḥammad ʿAbduḥ. “The religion of Islam, or Islam”, says ʿAbduḥ, “is the religion brought by Muḥammad” (Cairo 1353, 152). And the whole final section of the *Risāla* constantly speaks in this sense of Islam, its principles, its spirit and its extension in the world (*ibid.*, 152-206, French

trans., Paris 1925, 104-40). As soon as the *ummat al-nabī* began to expand in space and time in the face of other religious communities, what Prof. Cantwell Smith calls “reification” was found to be inscribed in the original fundamental data. Historical realities on the one hand, and the progress of the phenomenology of religions on the other, have not ceased to confront Muslim thought with this twofold fact: the existence of non-Muslim religions, established in their faith and their ritual observances, and, moreover, the uncertain faith and the failure to “practise” by certain men who none the less continue to invoke the help of the *umma*. Hence the anxiety to defend Islam as a religion and a community, while nevertheless the old Ḥanbalī and Ash‘arī distinction between *īmān* and islām is repeated and emphasized.

But this distinction, however generally admitted it may be, is in no way intended to justify the proclamation of islām by one who denies *īmān* or who even does not bother to appreciate the true values of faith. Those who are Muslims simply through having heard the call of Islam, or because they were born of Muslim parents, but who do not have faith in their hearts, then, according to what Muḥammad ftusayn Haykal more or less says (*loc. cit.*), their islām is feeble and sickly. Only those who seek for a sincere faith ( *īmān ṣādiq* ) hear the call to Islām with regard to God alone.

At the present time there are three meanings of the word islām says Prof. Cantwell Smith (*op. cit.*, 107): 1) the immediate existential meaning of personal surrender of oneself entirely to God; 2) the empirical reality of the “world of Islam”, as it exists sociologically; 3) the ideal Muslim community—“a concrete historical ideal” we would gladly say—as it must tend towards its realization. These three meanings in fact remain closely bound together in Muslim thought, today as in the past, and no study of Islam, no analysis of the Muslim Community or of the world of Islam should separate them.

---

## Bibliography

in the article.

(L. Gardet)

### ii.—DIFFUSION OF ISLAM

In our present state of knowledge, the diffusion of Islam can only be studied in broad outline. In the first place, with regard to numbers, we often have to be content with approximations; nor should it be forgotten that, with the world population increasing at an accelerated pace, even the most accurate statistics prove to be out of date within a few years. Moreover it sometimes happens that in certain countries Muslims and non-Muslims adopt different sets of



figures, particularly when these figures serve as the basis for political claims or considerations of honour. In the second place, such figures do not reflect the qualitative aspect of this diffusion. It is possible for conversions on a massive scale to be produced within the space of a few years (as in the case of the Galla tribes in Ethiopia, to the west of Harar, in about 1930-50). But it must not be forgotten that, for these conversions, the way had sometimes been prepared over a long period, by a whole process of maturing and by favourable circumstances which, in themselves, cannot be statistically expressed.

#### A.—General Survey.

The diffusion of Islam has been the consequence of a certain number of factors which are more or less easily discernable; over and above the particular attraction this religious movement has exerted upon men, the personality of its first leaders and the economic circumstances of Arabia at the time, among other things, there is a further point which requires to be examined—the part played by wars. Even if, in the vast majority of cases, the conquered remained free not to change their religion, the introduction by force of arms of a Muslim régime which took upon itself the administration of their country represented the first stage of a process which was bound to end in their gradual conversion.

The conquest itself was not brought about suddenly. It was often achieved in waves, with ebb and flow, but it was governed by a tide which, save in Europe, proved to be rising ever higher. Thus Damascus, reached as early as 13/634 by reconnaissance units, was attacked and conquered much later; recaptured by the Byzantines, it finally fell into the Arabs' hands ¶ in 636. Similarly Tunisia, wlicru a first raid in 26/647 was followed by a respite of more than twenty years before the final conquest and the founding of Ḳayrawān (50/670). So too Transoxiana to which, after an initial invasion in 52-4/672-4, the Arabs returned at the beginning of the following century; or Chinese Turkeṣtān, reached in 93/713, and to which they returned in 133/751 Kābūl in Afghānistān was reached by the end of the 1st/7th century, without being occupied, and two centuries were to pass before the Muslims came back in strength to stay. Muslim warfare had been a war of movement, a war of wide spaces, steppes or deserts.

The first period of expansion extends from the death of Muḥammad to the end of the Umayyad caliphate of Damascus. One century was enough for the Muslims to achieve an extraordinary epic feat. The dynamism of the new community combined with favourable circumstances to allow their success. The weakness of the Persians and the Byzantines after decades of war between them, their exhaustion, which caused them to underestimate the newcomers' strength, the internal conditions within the Roman empire of Byzantium which was then in difficulties, with its territory being engulfed by the barbarian invasions, the resentment of the various peoples ruled by Byzantium, the divisions among the Christians, all these considerations worked in favour of the Muslims. But the new fact, as compared with the

multiple barbarian invasions of the time, is that the barbarians were assimilated by the countries they conquered, whereas Islam on the contrary imposed itself upon the old civilizations. The most remarkable point about the diffusion of Islam is not so much the fact of the conquests as that of their permanence. When Islam became the religion of a territory, it never thereafter ceased to be so, except in Europe (and even then under armed pressure), and except in the centre and south of India, where many of the Hindu sultanates were revived after the first Muslim conquests.

In this way, we can trace the conquests of Syria-Palestine (13/634-19/640), Egypt 18/639-22/642), the Maghrib (49/699-85/705), Spain and Narbonnese Gaul 92/711-85/705), and, in the east, of 'Irāk (15/636-20/641), Armenia and then Iran (21/642), as far as Transoxiana and Chinese Turkestan. The river Indus was reached in 91-4/710-3, but these advanced positions were afterwards abandoned.

In the direction of Byzantium, which was besieged without success, the Muslim advance was blocked in Asia Minor where a state of flux for long prevailed.

In East Africa, colonies of Muslim merchants are recorded at a very early date at trading dépôts on the shores of the Indian Ocean.

Under the 'Abbāsids, these conquests were rounded off with the capture of Mediterranean islands such as the Balearics and Sicily. But, most important, Muslim culture was gradually taking shape, increasing the spread of Islam, and the populations, while left free to retain their faith, little by little adhered to the new religion, the religion of the ruling class and of the new society. In Spain, however, Islam was confronted by the Reconquest, which started early and eventually culminated in the fall of Granada in 1492.

Everywhere else, however, expansion continued, sometimes by force of arms, sometimes by peaceful proselytism. Towards the year 1000, the first stage in the conquest of India began: finally the whole Ganges valley was conquered in about 488/1192-606/1209. Various raids during the 8th/14th century succeeded in bringing almost the whole peninsula under the domination of the Muslims. They were however obliged to withdraw from many regions, especially in the centre and south. Islam came to Indonesia by way of a Muslim centre situated in the north-west of Sumatra, at the end of the 7th/13th century; in the 8th/14th century, Java was governed by Muslim rulers.

In sub-Saharan West Africa, it was shortly after the year 1000 that Islam was established. There is mention of a Muslim prince at the head of the Sonraïs at Gao on the Niger as early as 400/1009-10. Islamic rulers are found at Kanem (north of Lake Chad) in about 473/1081-90/1097. Little by little, Muslim kingdoms appeared (in particular Mali, in the 7th/13th century); but their Islam was still a religion of the court of the warlike or literate aristocracies,

which had no contact with the masses. It was later, with the military activities (especially of the Eulani) and the activities of the brotherhoods that the islamization of the masses was brought about, during the 18th and 19th centuries. Under colonial rule the process of conversion was extended still further.

In East Africa, Islam began to spread from Zayla' (a port situated opposite Aden) a centre of islamization even in the 6th/12th century. Climbing up to assail the high Ethiopian plateaux, where they never succeeded in gaining a real foothold, the Muslims established themselves firmly in the less elevated regions to the east and south (especially in Harar).

In the Nile valley, the Christian kingdoms of Nubia held out until the 8th/9th-14th/16th centuries, when they disappeared. The islamization of Nilotic Sudan was followed by that of the minor kingdoms situated between the Nile and Chad. In the 18th century, Islam came to predominance to the south of the Sahara, from the Atlantic to the Red Sea, except only in the Ethiopian Highlands.

Along the Gulf of Guinea, the impenetrable equatorial forest—even when not infested with tsetse flies—for a long time halted the shepherds who were the Muslim conquerors of the territory. But with the modern age the situation has changed. With the conversion of a section of the Yorubas (near Lagos) and penetration into other tribes hitherto reputed to be impossible to convert, with the movements of populations characteristic of countries today, this forest no longer forms a boundary, and many Muslims intermingle with the inhabitants of the coastal towns.

The commercial centres on the African coast of the Indian Ocean, which remained isolated in their world of business transactions, gradually became stronger (especially in the 4th/10th century). But it was in the 19th and 20th centuries that they became centres of islamization; the suppression of slavery and the opening of the hinterland had swept away the barriers that confined them to their trading-ports. Consequently there has been a considerable, though recent, advance by Islam in these zones during the last half-century (Kenya, Tanzania and even to the eastern Congo).

In all these conquered lands in Asia or Africa, or in all the sultanates ruled by Muslims, a special world was created, the Muslim world, where life, art and thought were marked by Islam, even though many traces of the past still survived. The simple imposition of a foreign political framework was very quickly followed by the adoption inwardly of Muslim values.

Finally, to conclude this general survey, it should be noted that the attack launched by the Ottoman Turks finally, in 1453, swept away the barrier of Constantinople. Europe was invaded as far as Vienna which was twice besieged, in 1529 and 1683, though without success. The ebb then followed, particularly in the 19th century and at the start of the 20th.

## B.—Present characteristics.

If we attempt to trace on a modern map the distribution of Muslims throughout the world, it becomes apparent that Islam is a religion which is almost confined to Asia and Africa. The only exceptions to this rule are some millions of Muslims in Turkey in Europe and in the Balkans, migrant and transient workers in western Europe, and immigrants in North and South America.

In the countries where Christian minorities remain, as well as in pagan countries, Islam is making progress, above all because, in order to be truly integrated into Muslim society, it is necessary to be a Muslim. Since this integration alone permits certain marriages, the proportion of the conversions to Islam undertaken on the occasion of marriages is very high. This integration also facilitates the finding of employment and advancement to higher posts. In certain countries, questions of social castes sometimes enter, since conversions take place particularly in certain strata of the population. But however that may be, in view of the simplicity of the Muslim dogma which places man face to face with God the Creator and Providence, and in view too of the aspect of fraternity which Islam presents to the newcomer (especially when he is received into a brotherhood), man's fundamental religious sense is satisfied. Thus the step to be taken does not deter anyone who is no longer greatly attached to his old religion.

Tolerance for ancient customs has also played a part in many countries, since Islam requires merely a profession of faith for a convert to be able to enter the community. Then, little by little, islamization has been effected in depth. Moreover, Muslim society, which gave the new member the satisfaction of belonging to a vast community covering the entire world, with its own military, cultural, religious and political renown, has always exerted effective control over him. While leaving those who served it very free, from the moment they made their profession of faith, it has always been at pains to protect its members from any possible proselytism and, above all, to prevent them from leaving Islam once they have adopted it. Until recently, the apostate was put to death; even now, proselytism is still strongly disapproved, and the man who deserts Islam cuts himself off from his own people, save in exceptional cases, even though modern jurists no longer authorize the death penalty for apostasy.

Paradoxically, among the features which have favoured the expansion of Islam during these last decades must be included colonial occupation. In many cases the occupying powers relied on Muslim elements possessing a higher degree of civilization than the pagans, in the countries where these still survived. Alternatively, it placed without discrimination under the same legal System inspired by Islam, both Muslims and those who were neither Muslim nor Christian. In the same way, by destroying the tribal framework of African paganism, colonialism created the great numbers of rootless people who have found in Islam a justification for social existence.

---

All the more since Islam has presented itself as a native religion, not as a colonial importation, while the difference in the standard of living, so obvious in the case of Christians newly arrived from Europe, did not arise between Muslims and pagans, who all sprang from the same soil. Peace too has assisted the movement of preachers or merchants belonging to brotherhoods.

In Black Africa, the ḵur'ānic schools have been centres of Muslim expansion, both through the scope they have given for zeal to have effect, and also through the number of future propagators of Islam who have been formed there. The poverty of the material equipment in the great majority of these establishments, like that of the curricula, must not be misinterpreted. Thanks to these, the values which the children there have learnt to respect, above all the sense of dedication and pride in belonging to the Muslim community, have profoundly marked whole regions. The story of David and Goliath is repeated in these schools in the triumph of poor resources. At the present time, incidentally, in many Muslim countries the official school has replaced the ḵur'ānic school.

The conditions affecting the expansion of Islam are extremely variable, according to the countries concerned, and we should not make any attempt to systematize them. There are large organizations working through pamphlets (like the Aḥmadiyya in Pakistan); there is the sending out of teachers and preachers; there is a whole System of instruction by radio. But the Muslim missionary apparatus is infinitely less cumbrous than that of the Christians. It is the natives of the country concerned who open schools, after having been sometimes (though not always) educated at centres abroad. It is the Muslims themselves, especially the merchants, who bear the chief responsibility for the missions. Finally, the brotherhoods have played a very great part in this movement. But whatever the differences, it is striking to observe wherever Islam is established, the same pride in the community, with as a consequence a certain number of common basic attitudes, affecting the manner of life and thought. This pride and its consequences, by favouring a certain impermeability to foreign influences, have been powerful weapons in resistance to colonialism.

For some thirty years, the Muslim world has been evolving very rapidly. Universities have been founded [see DJĀMI'Ā]. The instability of the world economy has made itself felt everywhere. Travels and contacts have multiplied. Socialism has changed the face of many societies. But, above all, Islam has adopted modern methods of communication— pamphlets, radio, television, etc. The number of people who listen on their transistors to sermons in *Ramaḍān* is now vast.

### C.—Statistical outline.

Basing themselves on the figures for world population valid in about 1960, some good authors privately estimated that there might be 435 million Muslims in the world. At the present time, with the increase in population, they now exceed 500 millions.



The figures which follow will indicate a total based upon the statistics for the populations of individual countries (in 1966), as contained in the *UNESCO Statistical Yearbook* (1967). After that, the article will provide details, so far as it is possible to do so, of the proportion of Muslims within the different countries. Figures given without further details signify the number in terms of *thousands* .

1.—AFRICA

(perhaps 130 million Muslims out of 318 million inhabitants).

a) *Arabic speaking Africa* (perhaps 70 million Muslims)

Morocco 13,451 (Muslims only)

—Mauritania 1,070

—Algeria 12,102 (total population)

—Tunisia 4,458 (id.)

—Libya 1,676 (id.)

¶

—E.A.R. (Egypt) 30,083, two million of whom are Christian

—Sudan (Khartoum) 13,940, 70% of whom are Muslim

b) *Africa south of the Sahara* , excluding the Sudan (perhaps 60 million Muslims)

—Somalia 2,580, of whom 99% are Muslim

—Nigeria 58,600 (?), of whom 43% are Muslim

—Ethiopia 23,000 (?), of whom 40 to 50% are Muslim

—Senegal 3,490, of whom 75% are Muslim

—Niger 3,433, of whom 72% are Muslim

—Mali 4,654, of whom 65% are Muslim

—Guinea 3,608, of whom 62% are Muslim

—Chad 3,361, of whom 55% are Muslim

—Upper Volta 4,955, of whom 26% are Muslim

—Tanzania 10,717, of whom 23% are Muslim

—Ghana 7,945, of whom 20% are Muslim

—Cameroon 5,350, of whom 20% are Muslim

—Kenya 9,643, of whom 10% are Muslim

Smaller numbers of Muslims are found in the following countries, in which they represent respectively the proportion of the population as indicated:

—Sierra Leone 33%, Gambia 73%, Portuguese Guinea 26%, Ivory Coast 25%, Dahomey 15%, Libéria 15%, Mozambique 11%, Malawi 7%, Botswana 5%, Togo 5%. Elsewhere the proportion is still smaller.

N.B. A better knowledge of the countries to the south of the Sahara made it possible, in about 1945, to assert the existence of numerous isolated pagan communities in regions thought to be wholly islamized (certain zones of Chad, North Cameroon, North Nigeria). Since then, a movement has been started among these pagans for conversion to Islam; in north-western Nigeria, this was vigorously supported by the political authorities, in the years preceding the disturbances of 1965.

For Nigeria, the reader will note a very clearly marked break in the rate of growth of population. As, until 1952, this was following a regular increasing curve, the figures given since that date correspond with an acceleration which requires to be explained before it can be accepted.

For Ethiopia, to which Eritrea has since been added, the *Annuaire du Monde Musulman*, 1954, accepts only half the figure officially given (cf. p. 389).

2.— ASIA (perhaps 390 million Muslims out of 1,868 million inhabitants)

a) *Arab countries of Asia* (perhaps 29 million Muslims), the principal centres being:

—Saudi Arabia 6,870

—Yemen 5,000

—Iraq 8,338, of whom 95% are Muslim

—Syria 5,450, of whom 88% are Muslim

—Lebanon 2,460, of whom 50% are Muslim

—Jordan 2,040, of whom 92% are Muslim

b) Islam in the USSR, 30 million (?) Muslims

c). Islam in the Middle East (perhaps 72 million Muslims), in

—Turkey 31,880, of whom 99% are Muslim

—Iran 25,781, of whom 98% are Muslim

—Afghanistan 15,960 (almost all Muslim).

d) Islam in Pakistan , India, Ceylon and Burma (perhaps 145 million Muslims), the two major groups being

—Pakistan 105,044, of whom 86% are Muslim

—India 498,680, of whom perhaps 11% are Muslim

e). Islam in China , 15 million (?) Muslims

f). Islam in South East Asia (perhaps 100 million Muslims), chiefly located in

—Indonesia 107,000, of whom 87% are Muslim

¶

—Malaysia and Singapore 10,212, of whom 44% are Muslim

—Philippines 33,477, of whom 5% are Muslim.

3.— EUROPE .

A little less than 5 million Muslims in the Balkans, to whom must be added the Muslim workers in western Europe, so far as they have not been included in the figures for their respective countries of origin.

To conclude this survey, the figure of 525 million Muslims might be suggested for the year 1966, a year during which the total world population has been estimated at 3,356 million inhabitants. The Muslims would represent about one-sixth of all human beings, or slightly less.

(J. Jomier)

---

---

## Bibliography

Since the list of books concerning this subject is too long to be given in full, the reader is referred to the bibliographies relating to the different countries dealt with above. A general survey of the expansion of Islam will be found in some historical atlases, such as the *Historical Atlas of the Muslim Peoples*, Djambatan-Amsterdam 1957. See also: L. Massignon, *Annuaire du Monde Musulman*, Paris 1955

U.N.E.S. C.O., *Statistical Yearbook*, 1967 (giving the figures for 1966). Some statistics are published by a number of countries: *Religion in the Middle East*, ii, London 1969

*Bilan du Monde 1960*, *Encyclopédie du Monde Chrétien*, ed. Casterman, ii, 1964

J. Ducruet and M. Martin, *Statistiques Chrétiennes d'Égypte*, in *Travaux et Jours*, Beirut no. 24 (July-Sept. 1967), 65-75.

Cite this page

Gardet, L.; J. Jomier. "Islam." *Encyclopaedia of Islam, Second Edition*. Edited by: P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel, W.P. Heinrichs. Brill Online, 2016. [Reference](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/islam-COM_0387). University of Texas at Austin. 29 April 2016 <[http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/islam-COM\\_0387](http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopaedia-of-islam-2/islam-COM_0387)>

First appeared online: 2012

First Print Edition: isbn: 9789004161214, 1960-2007